DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 065 UD 015 098

TITLE	Iowa Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1973. Title I of Public Law 89-10. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
INSTITUTION	Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des Moines.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	23p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Annual Reports; Educational Assessment; Educational Diagnosis; Educational Needs; Educational Planning; Information Dissemination; Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; Program Planning; State Schools; *Statistical Data; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Iowa

ABSTRACT

This State of Iowa annual evaluation report for fiscal year 1973 on programs, projects, services and activities funded in part or in whole under Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I is organized into seven sections dealing with the following topics respectively: basic state statistics, needs assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation, dissemination of information, and product evaluation data. Also included is a summary and eleven tables dealing with such topics as the following: (1) rankings of six most frequently used criteria for identification of children in need of supplementary educational programs and services; (2) rankings of five most frequently used groups of individuals for identification of children in need of supplementary educational programs and services; (3) rankings of five most frequently expressed problems for local education agencies in the implementation of projects; (4) ranking of impact of project on educationally deprived children; (5) ranking of five most frequently used means of dissemination by local education agencies with respect to Title I projects; (6) ranking of five most frequently used means of communicating between the state and local education agencies; (7) subjective evaluation ratings of public school mathematics and reading programs; and four others. (JM)

ED105065

IOWA

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973

Title I of Public Law 89-10

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction

FISCAL YEAR 1973
SCHOOL YEAR 1972-73

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 015098

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Muriel I. Shepard, President, Allison
T. J. Heronimus, Vice-President, Grundy Center
Robert J. Beecher, Creston
Jolly Ann Davidson, Clarinda
Ronald P. Hallock, West Des Moines
Virginia Harper, Fort Madison
Robert G. Koons, Clinton
Georgia A. Sievers, Avoca
John E. van der Linden, Sibley

ADMINISTRATION

Robert D. Benton, State Superintendent, and Executive Officer
of the State Board of Public Instruction
David H. Bechtel, Administrative Assistant
Richard N. Smith, Deputy State Superintendent

Prepared by:

Title I Unit
Pupil Personnel Services Branch
Drexel D. Lange, Associate Superintendent
Oliver T. Himley, Chief, Title I

P R E F A C E

The letter copied below was sent by a parent to members of the Iowa Congressional delegation requesting the continuance of Title I, ESEA. It is a form of evaluation which does not reflect itself in standardized tests.

Dear Sir:

We, as parents of a second grader receiving help thru Title I for reading, wish to express our sincere wishes that you as a United States Representative will see that legislation is enacted to continue the Title I program.

As a mother I can provide a well balanced meal, but if our child gets sick, I have the Doctor to turn to. Father provides a home and warm clothes and food for this child, but if he needs help he can turn to the banker. His teacher works hard to provide nourishment for his mind to grow. When she sees he needs extra help she has Title I to turn to.

Please do not let this good program die. Our child has benefited greatly thru the individual attention he receives from this program. I only hope when another child needs this extra help it will be there.

Thanking you for your time and consideration, we remain
_____parents.

Mr. and Mrs._____
315 South 9th
_____, Iowa

The copy of the hand written letter exemplifies the difficulty of presenting adequately the various merits of Title I, ESEA funded programs in hard data form. No achievement test gains in terms of grade levels or years and months for the youngsters in this family could ever convey the derived benefits as eloquently as the unsolicited letter did. Additional insights of this type will be provided later in this publication.

CONTENTS

	Page
Basic State Statistics	1
Needs Assessment	2
Planning	5
Implementation	6
Evaluation	8
Dissemination of Information	9
Product Evaluation Data	11 - 16
Summary	17

T A B L E S

Number	Title	Page
1	Rankings of Six Most Frequently Used Criteria For Identification of Children in Need of Supplementary Educational Programs and Services	3
2	Ranking of Five Most Frequently Used Groups of Individuals for Identification of Children in Need of Supplementary Educational Programs and Services	4
3	Ranking of Five Most Frequently Expressed Problems for Local Education Agencies in the Implementation of Projects	7
4	Ranking of Impact of Project on Educationally Deprived Children	8
5	Ranking of Five Most Frequently Used Means of Dissemination by Local Education Agencies with Respect to Title I Projects	9
6	Ranking of Five Most Frequently Used Means of Communicating Between the State and Local Education Agencies	10
7	Subjective Evaluation Ratings of Public School Mathematics and Reading Programs	12
8	Subjective Evaluation Ratings of Non-Public School Mathematics and Reading Programs	13
9	Statewide Data Relative to Reading Achievement In Terms of Grade Equivalent Scores in Public Schools	14
10	Statewide Data Relative to Mathematics Achievement in Terms of Grade Equivalent Scores in Public Schools	15
11	Statewide Data Relative to Reading Achievement In Terms of Grade Equivalent Scores in Non-Public Schools	16

BASIC STATE STATISTICS

A.	Total number of LEA's in Iowa	451
B.	Total number of LEA's participating in Title I	449
C.	Number of Cooperative Title I projects	1
D.	Total number of children served by Title I	
	1. Public school children	59,939
	2. Private school children	6,100
	3. Pre-school children	1,866

PROCESS EVALUATION

The LEA Annual Evaluation form was divided into two parts. The first part was entitled PROCESS EVALUATION. It was designed to hopefully provide the SEA with additional insights into LEA compliance with certain regulations, LEA problems and/or concerns, and to some extent, insights into the functioning of the SEA. The section entitled PROCESS EVALUATION included subsections dealing with needs assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation and dissemination of information. Each of those subsections will be reported separately.

Needs Assessment

Local education agencies used a multitude of needs assessment procedures in order to determine the needs of children in their districts. Most districts utilized three or more quantitative sources of information in addition to teacher recommendations. The six most frequently used methods of identification which were indicated in a questionnaire sent to local education agencies are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Ranking ... Most Frequently Used Criteria for Identification of Children in Need ... Supplementary Educational Programs and Services. (Most agencies use a combination of methods as indicated by frequency scores.)

Rank	Method of Identification	Frequency of Response
1	Achievement test scores	433
2	Teacher recommendations	430
3	Record of unsatisfactory academic achievement	392
4	Readiness scores	287
5	Evidence of psychological and/or social maladjustment	286
6	Indication of inadequate family resources	235

Quantitative data is important in the identification of youngsters in need of supplemental educational programs and/or services. The involvement of more than one individual in this analysis of data is also important. The five most frequently utilized groups of individuals identified in a questionnaire sent to local education agencies are presented in Table 2. It is interesting to note the parental involvement.

TABLE 2

Ranking of Five Most Frequently Used Groups of Individuals for Identification of Children in Need of Supplementary Educational Programs and Services. (Most agencies use a combination of methods as indicated by frequency scores.)

Rank	Groups of Individuals	Frequency of Response
1	Teachers	434
2	Public School Administrator	427
3	Parents	344
4	Specialized personnel--social worker, psychologist, etc.	326
5	Guidance Counselors	276

An overwhelming majority of local education agencies indicated that they felt they had developed a functional needs assessment procedure within their agency. The state education agency agrees with that opinion. The state education agency is frequently placed in a position where it must modify or not approve certain components of an LEA application. Title I, ESEA cannot fund many identified needs of children due to the fact that the proposed program is not supplemental in nature according to Title I, ESEA regulations. In essence, the LEA's frequently identify many more educational needs of youngsters than can be handled by Title I funds.

Planning

An adequate needs assessment procedure is only a preliminary step in the development and implementation of an excellent supplemental program. Planning implies the involvement of a number of individuals. The local educational agencies responded positively with respect to having included Parent Advisory Committees in the planning process. Some of the small and strictly rural LEA's do, however, experience difficulty in achieving what could be construed as an active PAC. The state agency understands the problem as these LEA patrons see little need to participate in a formal manner in expenditures that often times involve only one or two FTE teachers. Approximately one-fourth of the LEA's indicated that non-public school representatives were involved in program planning. Only a fraction of the LEA's in the state have non-public school students residing within the district. Of considerable hindrance to PAC's and local school agencies in the realm of planning is the lack of specific knowledge with respect to amount of funding. Carry-over provisions with respect to funding are a poor substitute for specific knowledge of allocations prior to the planning stage of project development.

Implementation

After the eligible youngsters have been identified, their needs assessed, and a program has been planned, the potential program effectiveness is still dependent upon how well the program is implemented. Staff development is an important aspect of achieving more nearly the full potential effectiveness of the program. It is, therefore, of interest to note that approximately one third of the full-time certificated teachers did receive in-service training so as to more ably perform the tasks they were employed to do. An overwhelming majority of these were individuals who attended the series of workshops pertaining to the teaching of reading conducted by Dr. Darrell D. Bentz of the state agency.

Local education agencies were surveyed to determine what problems they encountered in implementing their projects. Their responses again bear out the need for advance information with respect to amounts of the allocations. A logical sequence develops as will be noted in Table 3. When notification of the final allocation arrives too late, it results in inadequate planning time. This usually means late ordering of material and equipment which results in late deliveries of these items which also diminishes the program effectiveness.

TABLE 3

Ranking of Five Most Frequently Expressed Problems for Local Education Agencies in the Implementation of Projects.

Rank	Problems Cited	Frequency of Response
1	Notification of Title I allocation supplied too late	209
2	Inadequate planning time	73
3	Inadequate space to conduct project activities	62
4	Reluctance of parents to permit children to participate	57
5	Equipment and supplies were late in arriving	39

Evaluation

Data based upon achievement test scores will also be presented in this publication. The subjective evaluation of Title I programs should not, however, be minimized. Table 4 reports the results of a survey of the local educational agencies relative to program impact and clearly demonstrates that they were positive as opposed to being negative towards the program impact.

TABLE 4

Statement	Frequency of Response
The project had definite impact upon educationally deprived children.	363
The project had limited impact upon educationally deprived children.	63
The project was inappropriate and/or ineffective and needs to be changed.	3
It is not known what impact this project had upon educationally deprived children.	8

Dissemination of Information

Some dissemination of information relative to a project results from the normal PAC activities. The dissemination is still largely confined to the residents and employees of the respective LEA's. While this is important, it is also important to disseminate information to other LEA's. This is particularly important for the more successful programs which can be replicated elsewhere. Quite possibly it indicates an area in which the SEA will have to become more active. More specific information is contained in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Ranking of Five Most Frequently Used Means of Dissemination by Local Education Agencies with Respect to Title I Projects.

Rank	Means of Dissemination	Frequency of Response
1	Formal reports to local staff	283
2	Articles in newspapers	255
3	Presentations to local community organizations	193
4	Publications for local distribution	178
5	Joint meetings with staffs from other LEA's	95

State and Local Education Agency Contact

It is recognized that a healthy relationship between the LEA and the SEA is of considerable importance in complying with legislation and regulations. A healthy relationship is also of considerable importance in the improvement of existing programs and the development of new programs. Table 6 will provide insights into the amount of communication which was utilized by the two agencies. Such contact would range from possibly a brief telephone conversation with a given LEA to several meetings of considerable length with other LEA's. This, of course, is in addition to the regular on-site visitations, a tremendous amount of correspondence, and newsletters.

TABLE 6

Ranking of the Five Most Frequently Used Means of Communicating Between the State and Local Education Agencies.

Rank	Type of Communication	Frequency of Response
1	The publication, Submitting a Title I Project, provided assistance	389
2	Communicated by telephone to Title I staff	378
3	LEA had communicated with one or more members of DPI--other than Title I	239
4	LEA made one or more visits to Des Moines to confer with members of Title I staff	234
5	LEA was visited by one or more Title I staff members	232

PRODUCT EVALUATION DATA

The second part of the evaluation reporting form was entitled PRODUCT EVALUATION. It remains difficult, however, to present such data into meaningful state totals and/or averages. The better programs and the poorer programs, according to achievement data presented, become lost in the statewide totals and/or averages. In essence, the evaluation reports tend to be quite meaningful at the local school district level, less meaningful at the state level, and quite possibly even less meaningful at the national level.

TABLE 7

Subjective Evaluation Ratings of Public School Mathematics and Reading Programs

Grade	Reading					Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1	36.2	40.6	20.5	1.4	1.3	30.6	43.1	20.7	2.8	2.8
2	40.1	39.0	16.7	2.1	2.1	29.4	40.2	22.8	5.4	2.2
3	31.4	41.6	20.4	5.5	1.1	28.3	39.6	23.6	2.8	5.7
4	28.1	39.9	24.1	5.7	2.2	25.6	45.6	24.0	3.4	1.7
5	29.9	38.6	23.8	5.6	2.1	26.8	46.4	18.8	6.3	1.7
6	28.1	35.4	25.4	8.4	2.7	27.4	36.3	27.4	8.0	.9
7	23.8	41.1	26.2	6.4	2.5	29.5	32.8	29.5	3.3	4.9
8	26.3	38.9	25.1	6.9	2.8	32.1	43.4	22.6	1.9	0

LEA's submitted, in addition to achievement test data, their subjective ratings as to the effectiveness of their programs. Table seven reports on these ratings on the five point scale with "1" being the highest rating and "5" being the lowest rating. For example, 36.2% of the grade one responses rated the Title I reading program as having the highest possible rating. It should be noted that an overwhelming majority of the LEA's were quite satisfied with the effectiveness of their Title I programs at each grade level.

TABLE 8

Subjective Evaluation Ratings of Non-Public School Mathematics and Reading Programs

Grade	Reading					Mathematics				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1	33.3	33.3	22.3	7.4	3.7	0	83.3	16.7	0	0
2	57.1	18.4	20.4	4.1	0	55.2	24.1	19.0	1.7	0
3	36.5	34.9	20.6	4.8	3.2	79.4	11.8	5.9	2.9	0
4	26.2	41.0	24.6	4.9	3.3	44.4	15.6	37.8	2.2	0
5	35.6	30.5	27.1	5.1	1.7	51.0	7.8	39.2	2.0	0
6	42.2	22.2	26.7	6.7	2.2	44.5	29.6	25.9	0	0
7	38.1	33.3	19.1	9.5	0	0	64.7	35.3	0	0
8	22.2	44.5	22.2	11.1	0	26.7	46.6	26.7	0	0

Table eight indicates, for example, that 33.3% of the grade one responses rated the Title I reading program as having the highest possible rating as to effectiveness. The number of responses from non-public schools was not nearly as great as the number of public school responses. The pattern as to reactions to program effectiveness is quite similar, however, to that provided by the public school responses as indicated in table seven.

TABLE 9

Statewide Data Relative to Reading Achievement
In Terms of Grade Equivalent Scores
In Public Schools

Grade	No. of Students	Range of Gain	Mean Gain
2	4,607	.4 to 1.8	.9
3	4,946	.5 to 2.7	1.0
4	5,688	.3 to 1.5	1.0
5	5,094	.3 to 1.9	1.1
6	3,804	.4 to 1.6	1.1
7	3,192	.5 to 1.5	1.2
8	2,022	.6 to 1.8	1.1

Relatively few students participated beyond grade eight and are, therefore, not included in the table. Programs which were entitled "English-Language Arts" have not been included, but gains in those areas were of a similar nature. The mean gain as a statewide average gain for educationally disadvantaged students is quite remarkable for each of the grade levels.

TABLE 10

Statewide Data Relative to Mathematics Achievement
In Terms of Grade Equivalent Scores
In Public Schools

Grade	No. of Students	Range of Gain	Mean Gain
2	676	.3 to 1.2	.5
3	849	.4 to 2.3	.9
4	1,167	.2 to 1.3	.8
5	1,179	.3 to 1.3	.7
6	1,038	.3 to 2.2	.9
7	604	.5 to 1.5	.7
8	534	.4 to 1.4	.9

Relatively few students participated beyond grade eight and are, therefore, not included in the table. The mean gain as a statewide gain for educationally disadvantaged students does not compare favorably with the gains achieved in reading programs. One could only make assumptions as to the reasons for the difference, but it does indicate a need for additional in-service in the mathematics area of the programming.

TABLE 11

Statewide Data Relative to Reading Achievement
In Terms of Grade Equivalent Scores
In Non-Public Schools

Grade	No. of Students	Range of Gain	Mean Gain
2	675	.7 to 1.5	1.1
3	584	.6 to 1.0	.9
4	656	.1 to 1.7	.8
5	566	.1 to 1.4	1.0
6	413	.5 to 1.4	1.3
7	140	1.0 to 1.4	1.2
8	58	.1 to 1.0	.7

The comments made following Table 9 could be repeated regarding this table. The gains made as indicated above are very encouraging.

Summary

As was indicated earlier in this document, a variety of individuals have cooperated in identifying educational needs of educationally disadvantaged youngsters in each of the local education agencies. Progress has been made in assisting these youngsters to overcome certain educational handicaps. Much remains to be done, however, not only in terms of serving more youngsters in more ways, but also to serve them more effectively. Concerted cooperative efforts between the federal, state, and local agencies should make this a reality.